REMARKS

The office action of April 8, 2008, has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested. Claims 1 through 14, 43, 46, 49 and 52 through 68 remain in this case, claims 15 through 42, 44, 45, 47, 48, 50 and 51 being canceled, and claims 52 through 68 being added by this response.

Preliminary Comments

The claims were amended as follows:

> a. Independent claim 1 has been amended to better focus the claim on the invention. The material added to the claim can be found in the specification as filed, paragraphs [0013] through [0018] . No new matter was introduced.

> b. Dependent claims 2-12, 14, 43 and 46 were amended to conform the wording of the claims to the revised wording of claim 1 for antecedent basis purposes. No new matter was introduced.

> c. New claims 52 through 68 are method claims corresponding to the rewritten apparatus claims.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claims 1-42 and 46-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney (6317044) in view of Shniberg (6801245).

Applicant believes that independent claim 1, as amended by this response, and new method claim 52 corresponding to claim 1, are patentable over the combination of Maloney and Shniberg. Applicant also believes that the other remaining and new claims, all being dependent upon claims 1 or 52, should be patentable for the reasons stated below for claims 1 and 52, and for the elements which they add. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1, as amended, reads as follows (emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) An asset management system for managing a plurality of tangible assets **by a remote user using a web browser**, comprising

at least one security asset manager for receiving a tangible asset, comprising:

an asset control system including means for receiving and releasing tangible assets,

a **web server** coupled to the asset control system, and **having an I/O unit coupled to the internet**,

wherein the web server stores information regarding tangible asset transactions at the asset control system **and the remote user can access and control the asset management system remotely by communication via the internet between the web browser and the web server.**

The independent claim 1, as amended, and method claim 52 based thereon, make it clear that the security asset manager (previously "station") must have a *web server* built into it, *connected to the internet*, and that the remote user *uses a web browser* to access and control the system *via the internet*. This is a significant difference from the prior art, because the use of a web server at the security asset manager(s) and a web browser at the remote user allow remote control of the asset management system by a user without the need for special software at the remote user.

Maloney '044 is a local PC-based object control system. The remote controller (PC) communicates bidirectionally using serial signals over a parallel interface with the storage unit. This is inherently a short-distance networking setup. As described in columns 21 and following, Maloney's remote controller PC must be specially programmed to interpret specific serial signals on the parallel ports, and the PC is programmed to do the processing necessary to allow or block access to specific keys, etc.

In contrast, in the present invention, the asset control system in the security asset manager handles the receiving and releasing tangible assets, and a web server communicates with the asset control system and the internet to allow access and control of the system using a web

browser – that is, the remote user may access and control the asset management system over the internet, but it is the asset control system *in the security asset manager* which performs the functions which are done by the remote system (PC) in Maloney.

Thus, the combination of Maloney's remote controller and storage unit is analogous, at best, only to the asset control system of the security asset manager in the present invention – and only in that the combination of elements performs the same function, but at two different locations rather than as part of a security asset manager. Maloney lacks the web server with I/O unit coupled to the internet for communication with a remote user with a web browser, as required in amended claims 1 and 52.

Shniberg '245 is a package tracking system, allowing tracking of packages based on imaged identifiers (preferably a multicolor segmented disc or some other type of easily detected identification label). Images of the packages are processed by computers at various geographical locations as the packages pass through to extract alphanumeric or numerical identifiers coded onto the identifiers attached to the packages, and these are sent by the various computers to a remote tracking center over the internet. The remote tracking center compiles the records of the numerical/alphanumeric identifiers into a database and maintains a database of locations of packages. The patent does not provide details of the software at the remote tracking center, but given that it is described as compiling records from geographically disparate locations into a database for counting, tracking and locating, clearly this is not a general-purpose program such as a web browser as in the amended claims. Similarly, the patent provides little detail on the software at the package tracking computers, but given that it is described as doing image processing and extraction of identifiers from pictures of packages, etc., and sending it to the remote tracking center, this is clearly not a web server as in the amended claims. Thus, in Shniberg's system, a specially programmed remote tracking center communicates with many geographically diverse specially programmed computers to build a database of packages moving around the country.

The combination of Maloney and Shniberg would be an object control system as in Maloney, in which the remote controller and the storage unit communicate over the internet, as in Shniberg, instead of by serial signals on a parallel cable. As in Maloney alone, in the

combined Maloney/Shniberg system the combination of the remote controller and the storage unit correspond, at most, to the asset control system of the present invention in the amended claims (but differ in that they are in separate locations), and no web server or remote user accessing and controlling the asset management system over the internet using a web browser is taught or suggested by the combination of patents.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

2. Claims 43-45 and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maloney in view of Shniberg, and in further view of Blad (6675067).

Claims 44-45 and 50-51 were canceled. As to claims 43 and 49, these claims are dependent upon claim 1, as amended (claim 49 depends on claim 43, which depends on claim 1). The remarks as to the patentability of amended claim 1, above, are repeated herein by reference. Claims 43 and 49, being dependent upon claim 1, should be patentable for the reasons stated, and also for the additional elements which they add.

Blad is cited by the Examiner to add monitoring of environmental conditions.

Looking at Blad's figure 1, it can be seen that Blad has a number of "machines" (102) each communicating over the internet (108) with a central site (112), where data from the machines are collected in a data repository server and stored in a database by a database server. This is consistent with Maloney-plus-Shniberg, in that there is a central computer ("remote controller" in Maloney's terminology, "remote tracking center" in Shniberg) communicating with geographically scattered computers ("storage units" in Maloney, package shipping sites with image scanners, in Shniberg) over the internet. In Maloney, Shniberg and Blad, the central computer/remote controller/remote tracking center uses special software to communicate with special software at each of the soda machines/storage units/package scanners to exchange data and commands.

Blad's system does have a web server – *but at the central site, to allow the database server to communicate with a customer remote from the central site*. In other words, Blad's customer PC can access the accumulated data from the database via a web page – but this is common to many database servers. The individual soda machines in Blad (corresponding to the

security asset managers in the present application) do not have web servers, and the customer PC does not access or control the soda machines directly at all.

Combining Maloney, Shiberg and Blad would result in Maloney's system in which the communication between the storage units and the remote controller are over the internet and there are environmental monitors in the storage units.

In the present invention claimed in claims 43 and 49 (as amended), the remote user communicates through a web browser to a web server at each security asset manager to access and control the system (claim 1), and the web server monitors environmental conditions (claim 43) such as temperature (claim 49).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicants' attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

"Recognizing that Internet communications are not secured, I hereby authorize the PTO to communicate with me concerning any subject matter of this application by electronic mail. I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file."

Respectfully Submitted:
George Eckerdt

By: / mfb #29619 /
        Michael F. Brown, Reg. No. 29,619
Attorney for Applicant
BROWN & MICHAELS, P.C.
400 M&T Bank Building - 118 N. Tioga St. - Ithaca, NY 14850
(607) 256-2000 • (607) 256-3628 (fax)
e-mail: docket@bpmlegal.com
Dated: October 8, 2008